



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

*Handwritten signature*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.								
09/932,105	08/17/2001	Pieter Sierd Van Der Meulen	US 018126	5492								
7590 U.S. Philips Corporation 580 White Plains Road Tarrytown, NY 10591		01/09/2008	<table border="1"><tr><td colspan="2">EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">NEWLIN, TIMOTHY R</td></tr><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td>2623</td><td></td></tr></table>		EXAMINER		NEWLIN, TIMOTHY R		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2623	
EXAMINER												
NEWLIN, TIMOTHY R												
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER											
2623												
			<table border="1"><tr><td>MAIL DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>01/09/2008</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></table>	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	01/09/2008	PAPER					
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE											
01/09/2008	PAPER											

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/932,105	VAN DER MEULEN, PIETER SIERD	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Timothy R. Newlin	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 August 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/17/2001, 1/21/2003</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

1. Claim 18 is proper and is therefore not formally objected to. However, as written it is a duplicate of claim 1. For purposes of examination, it has been treated as if it depended from claim 15. It is rejected below in either case, but the matter is noted for the applicant's benefit.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas et al., US 2005/0198063, in view of Naughton et al., US 6,020,881.

4. Regarding claim 1, Thomas discloses an information processing system, comprising:

a camera for capturing an image of controllable equipment [**camera 514, Fig. 5A, para. 56**];

a server coupled to the camera and to a data network [**home monitor server 112, Fig. 1**]; and

an apparatus for receiving the image from the server via the network [**computer 108, Fig.1**] and comprising:

a display monitor for displaying the image [**computer 108 displays GUI 1400, Fig. 14**].

While Thomas does feature images of home appliances and graphical control of home appliances, the interface does not actually associate the command with the object image itself. Naughton does teach a control interface that associates an image with a command for control of the controllable equipment upon a user-interaction with the control interface. In Naughton, the user can select and manipulate objects via their respective images on a touch-screen display [**col. 11, 7-15**]. The user can view a graphical representation of a room and the devices therein, and may control a pictured remote device by interacting with the display image, [**col. 22, 5-30; col. 24, 60-67**]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the GUI methods of Naughton could be integrated into a camera-based control system of Thomas, because a webcam image conveys the exact appearance and devices within a room rather than merely a generic representation. One would be motivated to modify Thomas with Naughton, essentially combining Thomas's camera image display 1400 with the control panel 1500 [**Figs. 14 and 15**], to reduce the number of interfaces that the user must navigate.

5. Regarding claim 2, Naughton discloses a system wherein the control interface associates respective regions of the image with respective commands for control of the controllable equipment upon the user-interaction with the respective region **[regions of the image that contain controllable objects are distinguished by bright color and a black outline, col. 11, 34-45; objects may be selected and issued commands by pointing at their image on the screen, col. 12, 18-35]**.

6. Regarding claim 3, Naughton discloses a system wherein the control interface comprises a touch screen **[col. 15, 50-65; col. 24, 62-67]**.

7. Regarding claims 4 and 19, Naughton discloses a system wherein the control interface comprises a computer mouse **[col. 15, 55-57]**.

8. Regarding claims 5 and 20, Thomas discloses system wherein the control interface comprises controls for controlling the camera **[Figs. 14 and 17]**.

9. Regarding claim 6, Thomas discloses a system wherein the equipment is controllable via the server **[paras. 48 and 51-53, Fig. 14]**.

10. Regarding claim 7, Naughton discloses a system wherein the apparatus comprises software for configuring the associating of the respective regions with the respective commands **[e.g., col. 24, 43-67; col. 25, 43-58]**.

11. Regarding claim 8, Thomas discloses a method for enabling a user to remotely control equipment, the method comprising:

capturing an image of the equipment via a camera [camera 514, Fig. 5A, para. 56] coupled to a server [home monitor server 112, Fig. 1];

retrieving the image from the server via a data network [paras. 48 and 49]; and  
displaying the image on a display monitor [computer 108 displays GUI 1400, Fig. 14].

While Thomas does feature images of home appliances and graphical control of home appliances, the interface does not actually associate the command with the object image itself. Naughton does teach a control interface that associates an image with a command for control of the controllable equipment upon a user-interaction with the control interface. In Naughton, the user can select and manipulate objects via their respective images on a touch-screen display [col. 11, 7-15]. The user can view a graphical representation of a room and the devices therein, and may control a pictured remote device by interacting with the display image, [col. 22, 5-30; col. 24, 60-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the GUI methods of Naughton could be integrated into a camera-based control system of Thomas, because a webcam image conveys the exact appearance and devices within a room rather than merely a generic representation. One would be motivated to modify Thomas with Naughton, essentially combining Thomas's camera image display 1400 with the control

panel 1500 **[Figs. 14 and 15]**, to reduce the number of interfaces that the user must navigate.

12. Regarding claim 9, Naughton discloses a method further comprising the steps of:  
enabling the user to control a plurality of controllable entities of the equipment  
**[col. 24, 53-67];**

associating a respective region of the image with a respective command for control of a respective one of the plurality of controllable entities **[objects may be selected and issued commands by pointing at their image on the screen, col. 12, 18-35];** and

enabling the user to interact with the respective region for effecting the control of the respective one of the plurality of controllable entities **[regions of the image that contain controllable objects are distinguished by bright color and a black outline, col. 11, 34-45].**

13. Regarding claim 10, Thompson discloses a remote control system for remotely controlling equipment, the device comprising:

a camera for capturing an image of the equipment **[camera 514, Fig. 5A, para. 56];**

a data input for receiving, via a network, data representing the image of the equipment **[computer 108, Fig.1 receives image data from the internet, paras. 47-49];** and

a display monitor for display of the image **[computer 108 displays GUI 1400, Fig. 14]**.

While Thomas does feature images of home appliances and graphical control of home appliances, the interface does not actually associate the command with the object image itself. Naughton does teach a control interface that associates an image with a command for control of the controllable equipment upon a user-interaction with the control interface. In Naughton, the user can select and manipulate objects via their respective images on a touch-screen display **[col. 11, 7-15]**. The user can view a graphical representation of a room and the devices therein, and may control a pictured remote device by interacting with the display image, **[col. 22, 5-30; col. 24, 60-67]**. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the GUI methods of Naughton could be integrated into a camera-based control system of Thomas, because a webcam image conveys the exact appearance and devices within a room rather than merely a generic representation. One would be motivated to modify Thomas with Naughton, essentially combining Thomas's camera image display 1400 with the control panel 1500 **[Figs. 14 and 15]**, to reduce the number of interfaces that the user must navigate.

14. Regarding claims 11 and 17, Thomas discloses a system wherein the network is the Internet **[paras. 47 and 48]**.



15. Regarding claim 12, Thomas discloses a system wherein a Personal Digital Assistant having a wireless modem includes the data input, display monitor, and control interface for wirelessly communicating with a server via the network **[para. 70]**.

16. Regarding claim 13, Thomas discloses a system wherein a control network is coupled between the server and the equipment **[control network can be implemented via IR, UV, radio, or wire communication, para. 91]**.

17. Regarding claim 14, Naughton discloses a system further comprising software for associating a region of the image with a command for control of the equipment upon the user-interaction with the control interface **[e.g., col. 24, 43-67; col. 25, 43-58]**.

18. Regarding claim 15, Thomas discloses a remote control device for remotely controlling an apparatus, the device comprising:

a transmitted video image transmitted to the control device **[e.g., Fig. 14]**;

a control interface for associating an representative image of the apparatus with a command for control of the apparatus via a control network upon a user-interaction with the control interface **[cols. 24-25, lines 25-58; cols. 25-30]**.

While Thomas does feature images of home appliances and graphical control of home appliances, the interface does not actually associate the command with the object image itself. Naughton does teach a control interface for associating an representative image of the apparatus with a command for control of the apparatus via a control

network upon a user-interaction with the control interface **[cols. 24-25, lines 25-58; cols. 25-30]**. In Naughton, the user can select and manipulate objects via their respective images on a touch-screen display **[col. 11, 7-15]**. The user can view a graphical representation of a room and the devices therein, and may control a pictured remote device by interacting with the display image, **[col. 22, 5-30; col. 24, 60-67]**. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the GUI methods of Naughton could be integrated into a camera-based control system of Thomas, because a webcam image conveys the exact appearance and devices within a room rather than merely a generic representation. One would be motivated to modify Thomas with Naughton, essentially combining Thomas's camera image display 1400 with the control panel 1500 **[Figs. 14 and 15]**, to reduce the number of interfaces that the user must navigate.

19. Regarding claim 16, Thomas, discloses a device wherein the video image of the apparatus is obtained by a video camera and transmitted to the control interface via network **[Fig. 5A, para. 55]** coupled to the control network **[control network can be implemented via IR, UV, radio, or wire communication, para. 91]**.

20. Regarding claim 18, Naughton discloses a device of claim 1 (or 15), wherein the control interface comprises a touch screen **[col. 15, 50-65; col. 24, 62-67]**.


**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy R. Newlin whose telephone number is (571) 270-3015. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-6 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TRN

  
CHRIS KELLEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600